

SPEECH

OF

MR. WATTERSON OF TENNESSEE.

in the House of Representatives, April 2, 1840—In reply to Mr. BELL, on his bill to secure the freedom of elections, and to provide more effectually for the faithful administration of Executive patronage.

Mr. WATTERSON said:

I do not intend, on the present occasion, to take up much of the time of the House, by reading, iterating, and reiterating the opinions of Washington, of Jefferson, of Madison, and of Jackson, in regard to the principles embraced in the bill now brought forward by my honorable colleague. I shall content myself with stating, in plain language, my own views; and for them will I be responsible to those who sent me here, and to the country.

The bill is not a new acquaintance. It had its faint and comparatively harmless prototype in the sedition law of the elder Adams—a measure which overthrew the party that originated it; which brought about the political revolution of 1801; and which gave rise to that immortal declaration of the principles of this Government, by the Virginia Assembly, which has been adopted and recognised as the corner stone of Democracy. These principles will stand unshaken amid all the conflicts of party, and must continue to control this Government as long as it shall exist; for whenever the General Government shall go beyond its proper sphere, and assume arbitrary powers, or powers not delegated to it, it will come into collision with the State sovereignties, in such a manner as to cause its overthrow.

My first objection, therefore, to the bill proposed by my colleague, is, that it is unconstitutional. It interferes in a matter properly belonging to State authority, and over which this Government has no sort of control. Congress has no right to prescribe the qualifications of elec-

tors in the several States; nor the mode of conducting elections; nor the privileges or immunities of citizens in relation to elections. All this is left to State regulation. The States, if they see fit, can make any laws on this subject, not conflicting with their own and the Constitution of the United States. But no State has yet seen proper to direct its legislation against the influence or the acts of Federal officers, as distinguished from other classes of citizens. Congress is expressly prohibited by the words of the Constitution from making any law, "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." For wise reasons, the Constitution has been so framed as to withhold from the General Government any power to restrain the exercise of the right of speech, and the right of the press. To the States alone it belongs to judge how far these rights may be properly restricted. It is too late to argue this question. It has been settled by the almost unanimous voice of the people of these States.

The principles of this bill, however, are still more inconsistent with our Constitution, and with the doctrines of Jefferson and Madison, than those of the sedition law. The latter restrained the freedom of the press, but the former strikes at the liberty of speech. The sedition law allowed the truth to be given in justification of what was published; but this bill makes criminal even the suggestion of undisputed truth, in regard to public men and measures.

The object of the bill is to prevent Federal officers from intermeddling in elections, or, in other words, to gag them to deprive them of their rights under the Constitution; to forbid them from speaking on public affairs. My colleague, indeed, says, that his object is to emancipate these unfortunate men from Executive influence. It may be that, like the Turk, he would enslave, in order to proselyte; and, sir, if this bill could be made a law, the officers of the Government, against whom it

aimed, would be watched, and dogged, and misrepresented, and prosecuted, until they were driven into the sanctuary of the true Opposition faith.

I ask if the bill now brought in by my colleague, is not the same in principle, if not in detail, as that which was introduced into the Senate last year by a Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. CRITTENDEN,] and which incurred the marked disapprobation of that body, and of the people? If I am not mistaken, my colleague approved highly of that bill. I remember, said Mr. W. that I read the speech of my colleague on the harbor bill in the year 1836, in which he quotes, with much admiration, an old English statute, passed in the year 1701, prohibiting certain officers of the customs and excise, and of the post office, from giving their votes in any election of members of Parliament, or from persuading any elector to give, or dissuading him from giving, his vote in such election. He then called upon the freemen of the United States to take a lesson on this subject from the legislation of a Government less free than our own, and of an age in which Republicanism was known but in the visions of philosophers. The example drawn from English legislation, is an abridgement of the elective franchise. That Government has abridged the same right in an hundred different ways and under various pretences. It has indeed narrowed it down under any pretext which it supposed might reconcile the people to such encroachment. But why should we follow a precedent so hostile to the genius of our Government? Would the gentleman begin the work of suppressing the voice of freemen on public affairs, on any pretence, so as to familiarize us to a scheme which, among the Federalists, has always tended gradually to gag the people and restrict the right of suffrage. That party has never lost sight of their original plan of warping our Government into the British system.

This system, which my colleague believes to be so necessary to the preservation of the freedom of elections, in this free land, was adopted by a Senator, and brought forward, at the last session, in a bill which was a copy, word for word, of the British statute, which so much pleases my colleague. Five Senators were found to vote for it, two of them, perhaps, in compliment to the well known opinions of my colleague, but never was a bill less favored by the people or the States. My colleague, not discouraged by the ill success of this first attempt to which two of his friends in the other body were made a sacrifice, has again brought forward the same plan in a slightly modified form.

Can my colleague be surprised that a bill, the features of which are so well understood, and which has been so strongly reprobated, should be resisted on its threshold? Can he be surprised at the hesitation manifested even in granting leave to introduce the bill, or that a motion should now be made for its rejection? But having a fixed idea on this subject, and possessing unwavering confidence in his views of it, he commenced his speech with an expression of surprise that such opposition was manifested by a portion of his colleagues and others of the same political party, when he asked leave to introduce his bill. He told the House what the Globe would have said, in the event

leave had been refused. Whether the sketch which he drew was mere fancy or not, I do not feel myself called upon to give an opinion. I think, however, he is entirely mistaken in supposing that those who voted against leave, were actuated by the motives which he ascribes to them. They, no doubt, thought the bill was so abominable, that it was their duty to oppose it at every step of its progress—that it was so obnoxious, it could find but little favor even with the gentleman's own political friends upon this floor—that an unprofitable debate would arise upon it, which would consume much time, that should be devoted to the important public business of the country, requiring immediate action. Sir, I am not sure but they took the right course, and should have been sustained, though my vote stands recorded in favor of giving leave. It occurred to me, at the time, that, if my colleague were not permitted to hang a real *bona fide* stump speech, four years old, on this bill, about the office holders and Executive patronage, he would be certain to do so, when some other measure was under discussion; and that even in point of time, nothing could be saved by refusing to grant the leave desired. Moreover, sir, the bill has been on your docket for a long while, and I wish to see it disposed of—a vote taken upon it—and let the country know how many members are in favor of what I conceive to be its odious provisions. I hope, therefore, that no friend of the Administration will move to lay it upon the table, or to get clear of it in any other indirect way. Let us march right up to the main question, and if the bill contains the principles of the Whig party, the sooner the people know it the better. But I predict that, whenever we come to the sticking point, such dodging and hiding behind pillars, as there will be, has not been witnessed among my colleague's political friends, since the "*immortal five*" voted for Mr. CRITTENDEN's famous gag bill.

My colleague complains that the minority of this House are gagged by the majority. Where is the evidence of it? Is it to be found in the many elaborate electioneering speeches which have been made here by him and his political associates? Have they not wasted fivefold as much time in useless partisan debates, as has been wasted by the Democratic members? These facts are indisputable—they are blazoned on the records of our proceedings, yet, forsooth, the Opposition are gagged! Sir, if it were not for the "previous question" in the House, and a determination on the part of the majority to "set out" important questions in Committee of the Whole, it would be impossible to do any business—such is the disposition of the Whigs to stave off every question, to impede the progress of legislation. They oppose every thing and propose nothing. Like the architect of ruin, they are eternally endeavoring to pull down, and never once make an effort to build up.

Mr. Speaker, the clamor of the Opposition about office holders is not new to our ears. It is the cry of the *outs* against the *ins*. It will be as perpetual as the existence of parties. We have often heard it before. Strangers to the cry would be led to suppose, that all office holders, all who were so far honored with public confidence, as to hold any

public station of profit or trust, are necessarily enemies to their country—particularly if they should happen to hear the emphatic denunciations of them by my colleague. If, sir, there are too many office holders, let him specify them, and bring forward a bill to dispense with them, and I assure him that I will go for it. No proposition has yet come from him for that purpose, and none can be expected.

But, Mr. Speaker, is the purity of representation, and the freedom of elections, alone assailable by office holders of the General Government? Can my colleague see no danger from any other quarter? In the scenes which have lately passed before our eyes, and to which he alluded in his remarks on yesterday, can he not discover the danger to which elections, both of members of Congress and of the State Legislatures, are exposed from sources much nearer home than his supposed Executive influence? On the part of officers of the State Governments there have been daring attempts, of late years, to suppress the right of suffrage, and to control the results of elections. In one State, Pennsylvania, the policy was avowed by the minority party, then in power, of "treating the election as if it had not been held." The attempt was made in that and in one other State, by officers holding my colleague's political opinions, and sharing with him in abhorrence of Executive influence over elections—not to persuade a person to vote, or dissuade him from voting, this or that way—but to suppress the right of suffrage itself—to set aside the voice of the people—and, in short, to substitute the will of the minority, for that of the majority. Yes, sir, the acts of reckless and unprincipled officers of the State Governments, have been substituted, or attempted to be substituted, for a free election by the people; and, in all this, my colleague sees no cause of alarm, though in one case, it brought one of the largest and most respectable States in the Union, to the brink of revolution and civil war, and, in the other, led to a prolonged disorganization of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Again; elections are exposed to another vicious influence, which seems to have escaped the notice and reprobation of my colleague. I mean the influence of "associated wealth," of privileged corporations, acting in concert with State officers, against the policy of the Administration of the General Government. Is there no danger from this source? The tremendous money power of this country, and its natural ally, the money power of England, are brought to bear, as we have too often witnessed, not only upon elections, but upon the elected Representatives of the people. Who can estimate the danger to our institutions, of the concentration of this moneyed power in the hands of the General Government, which it is the object of the Whig party, who support the union of Bank and State, to effect? And this object is to be brought about, not by the Administration and its adherents, but by officers of the State Governments, acting in co-operation with money corporations, to control or set aside the popular will, as expressed at the polls.

But whence is this outcry against the interfer-

ence of officers of the Federal Government in elections? Does it not arise chiefly from those States where the Opposition to the Administration have the majority? If this influence can be felt much any where, it is in the large cities on the seaboard, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Providence, New Orleans, &c. where there are numbers of custom-house officers. But have not these cities been opposed to the Administration? In Philadelphia the majority for Ritner over Porter was upwards of four thousand. The city of New York, at the last Congressional election, went against the Administration; and if, with the aid of the registry law, the Whigs can drive the people from the polls, they hope to win it again. Who can attribute much influence, for or against an Administration, over the intelligent and spirited population of those cities, to a few weighers and gaugers, inspectors and tide waiters? At all events, their influence does not appear to have been very efficient in commanding a majority.

In the interior of the country, a Government officer is scarcely seen, nor is the power of the Executive, in any way, seen or felt. The workings of our system are so admirable, that the hand of the General Government is rarely visible there. The post offices comprise the only class of public officers that the people generally are often brought in contact with. There are about twelve thousand postmasters. But is it not notorious that more than half of those officers are Opposition men? Mr. Kendall so informs us, in a letter addressed to a member of this House, [Mr. DUNCAN,] at the last session. If any influence be exerted by office holders under the Federal Government, it must be chiefly through this army of officers, and more than half of them, I repeat, are Whigs. The Administration is likely, therefore, to lose at least as much as it can gain by their political influence. Most of these officers are men of some consideration in their own neighborhood, and take the office for the accommodation of their neighbors, and not for the emolument, which is but trifling—sometimes not five dollars a year. The office is too inconsiderable to attach them to an Executive; but, at the same time, it is one which they can, if they please, turn with great power and effect against an Administration, by distributing Federal documents, promoting subscriptions to Federal newspapers, and violating their official duty by franking. If these things are done at all, they can surely be done by the Opposition postmasters, to as great an extent, as by those who are friendly to the Administration.

It is in vain, then, that we look to the officers of the customs, or to the deputy postmasters, for the evidence of that influence in support of the Executive, which my colleague so much dreads. Where is it to be found? Will he point to Washington City for proof? Here, under the immediate influence of the President and his cabinet, three-fourths of all the citizens are Whigs. A large portion of the clerks and the heads of bureaus are also opposed to the present Democratic Administration. If, sir, the President is to be censured at all, it ought to be for keeping in office so many of his opponents. If he is to have all the odium, I think he ought to

have it for something. From the continual clamor about proscription, a person who knew nothing about it might well suppose that there is some truth in it; but the charge cannot be sustained by the facts of the case. The President does not agree to pursue such a course as I would urge. So far as I am concerned, I would, as to all important officers, sweep the political chessboard; and it is all sheer hypocrisy in the Opposition, when they make any other profession, because, whenever and wherever they have the power, they carry out the principles of indiscriminate proscription.

I would like to see the political friends of my colleague from the State of New York vote for the bill. During the Legislature now in session, the Whig Governor of that State turned out and refused to reappoint six hundred and more Democratic office holders, including those of the lowest grade, down to cullers of staves and heading, and inspectors of sole leather.

Is it not notorious that the Whig City Council of New York turned out every Democrat, even the street scavengers and lamp lighters? Did not the Ritner dynasty carry out the spoils principle, as my colleague has been pleased to call it with a vengeance? He made a clean sweep. The white laborers on the public works were dismissed, and as I have just been informed, negroes were put in their places. In New Jersey, the great broad seal State, every justice of the peace was dismissed; and in Massachusetts, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and every other State where they have held the power, the same course has been pursued. If the country should be cursed by the election of the nominee of the Harrisburg Convention, they will change their clamor; but there is no danger that they will ever have that cause for ceasing their hypocritical cry of proscription.

Here, I would have it understood, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding I am for a pretty general tumbling overboard, yet I would censure the President, or any other man, for turning out competent, meritorious, and respectable officers, and appointing others just the reverse. But so long as I could find among my own friends, those who were equally competent and deserving, I would invariably give them the preference.

Such, sir, was the doctrine of General Washington in his administration, and who will dispute its correctness? No Administration can, or ought to be supported, that treats its friends with neglect and injustice.

Gen. Washington's opinion on this subject is worthy of repetition in connection with this clamor about proscription. "I shall not," he says, "whilst I have the honor to administer the Government, bring a man into any office of consequence, knowingly, whose political tenets are adverse to the measures which the General Government is pursuing; for this, in my opinion, would be a sort of political suicide. That it would embarrass its movements is certain."

Mr. Speaker, I would call attention to the facts contained in a message from the President, in answer to a resolution requesting lists of officers who derive their appointments from the President and Senate, and who have been dismissed from office since the 3d of March, 1789, up to the 3d of

March, 1840. Out of those whose commissions are recorded in the office of the Secretary of State, embracing most of the higher officers, the following number of removals have been made, to wit:

	Van Buren, 3 yrs.	9
	Jackson, 8 yrs.	5
	Adams, 4 yrs.	85
	Montroe, 8 yrs.	17
	Madison, 8 yrs.	16
	Jefferson, 8 yrs.	7
	Adams, 4 yrs.	3
	Washington, 8 yrs.	10
Army officers removed by order of the President		4
Navy officers removed by order of the President		7
Marine corps		1

Those whose commissions have been recorded in the Treasury Office since 1833; the records before that time were burnt

10 14

Since the day 2d day of July, 1836, a large class of postmasters receive their appointments from the President and Senate, of which class there have been removed by Mr. Van Buren thirteen.

These results show that but forty removals have been made by Mr. Van Buren, since he came into power, and should put to shame my colleague and others, who are making such an outcry against him for removing "so many" for opinion's sake.

My colleague has been pleased to denominate the Democratic party as the vampire party, and said it could not stand a day if his bill, or the bill introduced in the other end of the Capitol, of like import, had passed; that they would have the same effect on the Democratic party as did the surgeon's knife in despatching the vampire—a history of the existence and destruction of which he cited. What has been the consequence of the use of this surgeon's knife—the gag bill—in the Senate? Whether intended or not, it has bled to death politically two of my colleague's friends, the late Senators from Tennessee, and, should it ever come to a vote in this House, as I hope it will, it may have some further effect in the same way, if indeed it should obtain any votes.

Another charge, which is constantly sounded in our ears in connection with this subject of Executive patronage, is that of defalcation—defalcation. Gentlemen of the Opposition would make the world believe that there have been no defaulters in their ranks. But, sir, we have official documents here to which I appeal for testimony on this subject.

The tremendous defalcation in the city of New York, which furnished so much political capital to the Opposition, and added a new word to our vocabularies, cannot be considered in any other light than a Whig defalcation. The defaulter himself was any thing but a Democrat, and he was supported, recommended, and urged for reappointment by his Whig and Conservative friends. But, waiving this, I am ready to prove, from a document which I hold in my hand, giving a list of defaulters, and the amount of defalcations, from the organization of the Government in 1789, to March 4th, 1837, that there was less money lost under the administration of General Jackson, than was lost under any other Administration since that of George Washington, in proportion to the amounts collected and disbursed. I read from a report submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, December 30, 1839

DISBURSEMENT.

	Amount of Defalcation	Average number of persons employed.	Ratio of loss per head to average number employed.	Ratio per hundred dollars to aggregate expenditure in each period.
WASHINGTON.				
1st four years,	\$4,889 13	213	\$22 95	13
2d four years,	32,738 23	400	81 82	27
ADAMS.				
Four years,	170,770 92	535	330 41	83
JEFFERSON.				
1st four years,	54,419 42	622	87 49	32
2d four years,	152,568 70	596	255 99	64
MADISON.				
1st four years,	469,352 73	854	539 05	1 30
2d four years,	1,217,822 06	2076	597 60	1 12
MONROE.				
1st four years,	1,207,193 15	1536	785 90	2 05
2d four years,	986,642 53	1052	937 87	2 16
J. Q. ADAMS.				
Four years,	327,387 49	823	397 79	66
JACKSON.				
1st four years,	105 502 88	852	123 83	19
2d four years,	230,336 32	971	237 22	26

COLLECTION.

WASHINGTON.				
1st four years,		51		
2d four years,	\$7,855 80	83	\$94 63	03
ADAMS.				
Four years,	244,945 60	95	2578 37	72
JEFFERSON.				
1st four years,	36,219 05	100	362 10	74
2d four years,	247,278 70	103	2400 16	39
MADISON.				
1st four years,	172,738 12	107	1664 00	43
2d four years,	86,870 37	207	330 56	10
MONROE.				
1st four years,	400,022 44	222	1801 90	42
2d four years,	253,805 25	130	1967 39	35
J. Q. ADAMS.				
Four years,	189,721 80	133	1449 00	20
JACKSON.				
1st four years,	184,444 65	139	1326 94	17
2d four years,	214,648 03	161	1335 08	15

From 1789 to 1837 inclusive, the Government lost, by using banks as depositories, and receiving their notes in payment of public dues, *thirty-four millions nine hundred and seventy-four thousand seven hundred and twenty-two dollars!*

Exhibit of the amount of indebtedness to the Government on custom-house bonds, embracing successive periods of four years, from 1789 to 1837, and the amount of duties collected during the same period.

	Whole loss each four years.	Whole amount of duties collected each four years.
4th Mar. 1789, to 4th Mar. 1793	\$686 46	\$12,097,850 50
4th Mar. 1793, to 4th Mar. 1797	82,359 84	24,552,164 13
4th Mar. 1797, to 4th Mar. 1801	85,179 98	33,548,222 90
4th Mar. 1801, to 4th Mar. 1805	61,872 69	46,952,705 72
4th Mar. 1805, to 4th Mar. 1809	122,478 51	54,172,790 94
4th Mar. 1809, to 4th Mar. 1813	374,6 4 23	44,079,932 82
4th Mar. 1813, to 4th Mar. 1817	688,836 51	75,871,937 67
4th Mar. 1817, to 4th Mar. 1821	880,111 67	65,470,053 06
4th Mar. 1821, to 4th Mar. 1825	1,568,476 17	74,655,234 54
4th Mar. 1825, to 4th Mar. 1829	2,278,558 47	88,941,104 61
4th Mar. 1829, to 4th Mar. 1833	299,798 51	103,644,579 31
4th Mar. 1833, to 4th Mar. 1837	1,305,305 45	70,185,498 66
Total,	\$7,748,318 89	\$694,172,034 86

It will be seen, by glancing over the above official statement, among other things, that during General Jackson's administration, the losses by defalcations amounted to but twenty-two and a half cents on each hundred dollars of the aggregate expenditures, and sixteen cents on the aggregate collections, whilst during John Quincy Adams's administration, the losses of the former amounted to sixty-six cents on each hundred dollars, and those of the latter to twenty cents on each \$100. Yet my colleague and his political associates are exerting every nerve to restore that Administration to power; for though it is not proposed to advance the same man, it is to restore the same odious Federal principles.

Of all the collectors and receivers appointed by Mr. Van Buren, the official documents will show that up to this time there is not one dollar lost by a defalcation on their part.

Now, sir, as my colleague has so much to say about office holders, it may not be improper to talk about a much more numerous, importunate, noisy, and hungry class, the *office seekers*. Here I would remark, that the energies of office seekers are stimulated by hope of spoil, or by resentment for rejection; and their efforts in opposition to an administration, are much more zealous and efficient than those made by its friends in its favor. It has been doubted, indeed, whether an administration gains any friends through its patronage. Where one person is appointed, many are disappointed, and become disaffected. A French Minister remarked, that in giving appointments to office, he made "a dozen enemies, and one ingrate." Office seekers, too, are more free in the use of party weapons, than their adversaries, the office holders, can be.

Mr. Speaker, I would now call attention to a very extraordinary correspondence between the Union Association of Oswego, New York, and General Harrison's confidential committee at Cin-

cinnati, who have taken him under their especial keeping. They do not intend, it seems, that he shall answer any interrogatories which may be put to him on the subject of Abolition, the Bank, or any other important question, lest he may displease some of the factions that compose the Whig party. They have given him his orders not to make any "further declaration of his principles, for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position." They say they are satisfied that this is the most politic course, from the "consideration that the National Convention deemed it impolitic, at the then crisis, to publish any general declaration of the views of the great Opposition party." Why they did not, I shall take occasion to make known, before I resume my seat. This committee further remark, that, when they reflect "how ably all interests were represented" in the Harrisburg convention, the country will have "a high guarantee" that, "should General Harrison be elected to the Presidency, the office will be happily and constitutionally administered, under the guidance of the same principles which directed our Washington, Jefferson, and Madison."

How ably "all interests" were represented in that convention, I will also furnish abundant evidence—evidence which, I fear, will disturb the equanimity of many a good Whig throughout the country.

But who are these conscience keepers of Gen. Harrison, who have fallen so much in love with Jeffersonian principles? Two of them, I understand, are young knights of the green bag, who are in no way identified with the Democracy of the country, and who, if Mr. Jefferson were President now, would oppose him with the same zeal that they oppose the re-election of Martin Van Buren. The other is the notorious John C. Wright, who represented a Jackson district in Congress in 1825, but, in violation of their will and wishes, voted for John Quincy Adams. He edited, I have been informed, a Federal newspaper in Troy, New York, from 1805 to 1809, and heaped such wholesale abuse upon Mr. Jefferson, and the Democratic party, that he was frequently prosecuted for libels, judgments obtained against him, he was broken up, and had to emigrate. Yet, strange to tell, he has become of late a great admirer of Jeffersonian Republicanism! Such are the men who surround Gen. Harrison, and have charge of his opinions—who impudently tell the American people, if they are not pleased with Gen. Harrison's refusal to make any "further declaration of his views," they must attribute the error to them and "his immediate advisers."

Whilst, sir, my colleague is for gagging the office holders, this Federal clique have actually muzzled the chief of the office seekers. Knowing that his principles are in conflict with the best interests of the country, they use him like a machine, which never acts until it is acted upon. When before did a candidate for the highest office within the gift of a free people deny their right to interrogate him on all subjects of public interest? Gen. Harrison has virtually done so, by placing himself in the hands of a confidential committee, who have sealed his lips, and instructed him "to lie low and keep dark" until after the election. Sir, if I had no other objection to Gen. Harrison under the eternal sun of God's heavens, this would be suffi-

cent. It should make every patriot deprecate his election as the greatest calamity that could befall the nation.

But it is pretended that Gen. Jackson had a similar committee. Not a word of this is true. He is not the man to be put in strings, and pulled about like an automaton. He always gave his opinions freely, when interrogated; he never was afraid to "take the responsibility" of saying what he thought, and he ever thought what he said. The Jackson committee at Nashville was selected by the people, for the purpose of defending his character against the ruthless attacks, the infamous slanders, which the Federal party were propagating against him—a thing he disdained to do himself—and not for the purpose of hiding his views or speaking for him on a single political question. No man upon the face of the earth would scorn to have around him a "pack of keepers," more than General Jackson. He is made of different metal, and thank God for it. Before and after his election as President, he answered every interrogatory put to him by committees or individuals, in his own proper name and person.

I will now read the correspondence between General Harrison's "thinkers" and the association alluded to, and will make no further comments. Let the country read and judge for themselves.

OSWEGO, Jan 31, 1840.

TO THE HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON:

DEAR SIR: In accordance with a resolution of the Union Association of Oswego, I am instructed to propose three questions to you, in relation to subjects that a large portion of this section of the country feel a deep interest in. The first is—

Are you in favor of receiving and referring petitions for the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?

Second—Are you in favor of a United States Bank or some institution similar to that, for the safe keeping and disbursing of the public moneys, and for giving a uniform currency throughout the United States?

And lastly—Would you favor the passage of a General Bankrupt Law, by Congress,—so that its operations might be equal in all the States of the Union?

I have only to say, sir, that the above inquiries are made in accordance with the unanimous wishes of this association, the members of which, I am instructed to say, entertain the highest regard for your past services, and hope, should you be elected to the high office for which you are nominated, that nothing may occur to lessen you in the estimation of a great and free people.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

MILES HOTCHKISS,

Corresponding Secretary.

CINCINNATI, Feb. 29, 1840.

OSWEGO UNION ASSOCIATION:

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of the 31st ult. addressed to General Harrison, has been placed in our possession with a view to early attention. This is unavoidable in consequence of the very numerous letters daily received by the General, and to which his reply in person is rendered absolutely impracticable. As from his confidential committee, you will look upon this response; and if the policy observed by the committee should not meet with your approbation, you will attribute the error rather to ourselves and his immediate advisers than Gen. Harrison. That policy is, that the General make no further declaration of his principles, for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position.

Such a course has been adopted, not for purposes of concealment, nor to avoid all proper responsibility; but under the impression that the General's views, in regard to all the important and exciting questions of the day, have heretofore been given to the public, fully and explicitly; and that those views, whether connected with constitutional or other questions of very general interest, have undergone no change. The committee are strengthened in regard to the propriety of this policy; that no new issue be made to the public, from the consideration that the national convention deemed it impolitic at the then crisis, to publish any general declaration of the views of the great Opposition party, and certainly the policy, at the present, remains

unaltered. In the mean time, we cannot help expressing the hope, that our friends, every where, will receive the nomination of Gen. Harrison with something akin to general confidence. When we reflect upon the distinguished intelligence of the nominating convention—how ably all interests were represented in that body; we certainly have a high guarantee, that should General Harrison be the successful candidate for the Presidency, that office will be happily and constitutionally administered, and under the guidance of the same principles which directed our Washington, Jefferson, and Madison. Believing you will concur with us in the propriety of the policy adopted, we have the pleasure in subscribing ourselves

Your friends,

DAVID GWYNNE,
J. C. WRIGHT,
O. M. SPENCER.

H. E. SPENCER, Cor. Sec'y.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said by the Whigs about Gen. Harrison's pretended poverty. For popular effect, they have denominated him the log cabin and hard cider candidate. Sir, if you could travel down the Ohio river and look at his princely estate at North Bend—with a dwelling more like a palace than a cottage—with two or three thousand acres of land, worth from fifty to one hundred dollars per acre, and surrounded by every comfort that life can bestow, you would be ready to exclaim, "if this be poverty, then I am willing to be poor the remainder of my days." Born of wealthy parentage, he never knew what want was. And why should he? Ever since he left his paternal roof, he has been sucking at the Treasury pap—has been an office holder—and has pocketed from the General Government between seventy and eighty thousand dollars! I do not make this assertion without being armed with proof, as the official statement which I have will show. Let it be read every where.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
April, 1840.

SIR: In compliance with your verbal request, I have the honor herewith to enclose you the desired copies of statements in relation to compensation received by Wm. Henry Harrison.

Very respectfully,

LEVI WOODBURY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. H. M. WATTESON,
House of Representatives.

Statement of the public money paid to William Henry Harrison, in the civil and diplomatic capacity in which he was employed.

Years.	In what capacity.	Payments.
1799.	Secretary of the Government of the Western Territory,	\$1,068 00
1800.	Do. do.	42 50
1799–1800.	Delegate in Congress, Government of Indiana Territory—salary,	1,476 00
		483 69
1801.	Do. do.	2,000 00
1802.	Do. do.	2,000 00
1803.	Do. do.	2,000 00
1804.	Do. salary and expenses letting Salt Springs,	2,288 60
1805.	Do. salary and contingent expenses,	2,600 00
"	Do. printing laws, public seals, &c.	763 50
1806.	Do. salary and contingent expenses,	2,109 52
1807.	Do. do.	2,332 21
1808.	Do. do.	2,059 61
1809.	Do. do. and county seals,	2,022 00

1810.	Do.	do.	2,035 45
1811.	Do.	do.	2,040 00
1812.	Do.	do.	2,000 00
1816–'17.	Representative in Congress,		1,268 00
1817–'18.	Do.	do.	1,587 20
1818–'19.	Do.	do.	1,323 20
1825–'26.	Senator,	-	1,896 00
1826–'27.	Do.	do.	1,264 00
1827–'28.	Do.	do.	1,952 00
1828.	Minister to Colombia,	-	14,439 56
1829.	Do.	do.	9000 00

\$62,051 04

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, REGISTER'S OFFICE,
March 20, 1840.

T. L. SMITH, Register.

Statement of the amount of public money paid to Wm. H. Harrison, esq. for his services in the civil and military capacities in which he has been employed by the Government, so far as has been ascertained from the books and files of the office of the Third Auditor, prepared in pursuance of a letter from the Hon. A. Smith, H. R. of the 19th March, 1840, referred to this office by the Secretary of the Treasury for a report, viz:

Pay as Ensign in the First Regiment of Infantry, from the 16th August, 1791, the date of his acceptance, to the 1st June, 1792, and as Lieutenant from the 2d June, 1792, to the 13th August, 1793	\$553 06
Subsistence from the 16th Aug. 1791, to 13th Aug. 1793, and as Lieutenant and Aid-de-Camp from 14th August to 6th October, 1793	143 16
Forage as Aid-de-Camp from the 14th August to November 1, 1793	26 00
Pay as Captain from 1st October, 1797, to the 17th June, 1798, the date of his resignation	342 67
Subsistence for the same time	204 52
	<u>\$1,269 41</u>

The records of the office furnish no evidence as to the payments made to him between August, 1793, and the 1st October, 1797. He no doubt received the pay and emoluments to which his rank entitled him, and for which he would receipt on the field and staff and company rolls; the accounts, however, being destroyed by the burning of the public buildings, the amount cannot now be ascertained.

Pay and emoluments as Major General in command of the troops on the Northwestern frontier and Northwestern army, from the 25th August, 1812, to the 1st March, 1813, and as Major General of the United States Army from the 2d March, 1813, the date of his appointment, to the 31st May, 1814, when he resigned, viz:

From the 25th August, 1812, to the 31st July, 1813	\$4,343 70
From the 1st December, 1813, to the 31st May, 1814	2,559 40
	<u>\$6,903 10</u>

For the period between the 31st July, 1813, and the 30th November, 1813, four months, the pay—

ments made to him have not, after the most diligent search of numerous paymasters' accounts, been found; the amount cannot, therefore, be ascertained.

Payments whilst Governor of Indiana Territory.

For services as commissioner treating with the Indians from 31st July to 31st August, 1804, 32 days, at \$6 - - - \$192

Expenses and subsistence same time, at \$3 - - - 96

\$288

For services as commissioner going to St. Louis, and negotiating a treaty with the Sac Indians, from the 7th October to 20th November, 1804, 45 days, at \$6 \$270

Expenses and subsistence same time, at \$3 - - - 135

405

For services as commissioner negotiating a treaty with the Miamies, and going to St. Louis to make a treaty with sundry tribes of Indians from the 26th July to the 31st December, 1805, 159 days, at \$6 - - - \$954

Expenses and subsistence same time, at \$3 - - - 477

1,431

For services as agent negotiating a convention with the Miamies, Pottawatamies and Weas Indians, for fixing the limits of the Wabash tract, to include the Wabash saline, in August and September, 1802, 35 days, at \$3 \$105

Expenses and subsistence same time, at \$2 - - - 70

175

For services as commissioner treating with the Indians from August 11 to September 25, 1815, 44 days, at \$8 - - - 352

\$2,651

Amount rec'd in his civil capacity, \$2,651 00
Amount rec'd in his military capacity, 8,172 51

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

THIRD AUDITOR'S OFFICE, March 25, 1840.

PETER HAGNER, Auditor.

These statements, sir, do not include the thousands which Gen. Harrison is annually receiving from the office he now holds at Cincinnati. They show, too, that from the time he first entered the public service, up to the last payment which was made him, he received about two thousand dollars per annum! Away, then, with the misrepresentations of the Opposition in reference to his pecuniary condition. Let them cease the doleful cry of

"Pity the sorrows of a poor old man,"

and no more attempt to foist him into the Presidential chair, by appealing to our sympathies, rather than to our judgments.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a pamphlet containing the proceedings of the late Harrisburg

Convention, together with the names of the delegates from the several States, who nominated Gen. Harrison a candidate for the Presidency. In looking over this pamphlet, the inquiry suggested itself to my mind, who were these delegates? What are their professions? What are their principles? Were they delegates "fresh from the people," or were they the representatives of moneyed corporations, of mere town politicians and street brawlers? Although I knew the task would be an arduous one, and the performance of it might call down upon my head the vengeance of the Opposition, yet I set about it, and have collected a mass of information on all these points, which I will take this opportunity of laying before the House and the country. I would here state that I have derived my information, not from one, nor two, but at least fifty members of Congress from every portion of the Union, and have full confidence myself, that it is strictly correct, so far as it goes. If, however, I should make any statement which is not substantially true, in regard to a single delegate in that convention, I wish to be corrected as I proceed. I would do no man intentional injustice, neither will I deal in abuse. I will simply give such facts as I have been able to obtain, and in doing which, it will be clearly shown, whether General Harrison is the "people's candidate" or not—whether he is the candidate of those who live in "log cabins" and drink "hard cider." I will also note those who were for John Q. Adams for the Presidency. I wish to show the gentleman from Massachusetts how many old friends he had in the Harrisburg convention, and at the same time to let my colleague see with whom he and the Whigs of Tennessee are co-operating. It may be that my colleague has changed his opinions of his present political associates since 1827, when he charged Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, in a letter to his constituents, with coming into power under "*circumstances affording all the evidences of a coalition, formed upon the basis of mutual benefits to be received and conferred,*" when he alleged that doctrines were held by that Administration, "*subversive of the first principles of free Government.*" At any rate he seems to be in strange company. But to the convention:

PRESIDENT.

JAMES BARBOUR of Virginia, lawyer, was Mr. Adams's Secretary at War; also Minister to England under the same Administration.

Mr. LINCOLN rose, and called the gentleman to order. He was not in the habit of interrupting the course of the discussions going on, but the course of debate of the gentleman from Tennessee was such, that he felt it his duty to endeavor to put a stop to it. The gentleman was giving biographical sketches, and commenting on the political conduct of individuals over the whole Union. Such a course of debate was entirely out of order; and he called upon the SPEAKER now to decide whether the rules of the House were to be enforced or not.

Mr. WATTERSON said that his colleague [Mr. BELL] had yesterday entertained the House with a discussion on the influences exercised by office holders in the political affairs of the country, and he thought it but right, as an offset to that course of argument, to show the influence attempted and exercised by those seeking office. He wanted to show the political characters of the motley assemblage of those seeking to break down the

present Administration, and the discordant materials of which their party was composed.

MESSRS. STARKWEATHER, GENTRY, MASON, WISE, BRIGGS, and WELLER, also spoke to this point of order, when on motion of Mr. WELLER, Mr. WATTERSON, was permitted to go on.

Mr. WATTERSON regretted very much that he had been interrupted, because he could have concluded his remarks in the time occupied by the interruption. He said his colleague [Mr. BELL] had been denouncing the officers of the Government as vampires, sucking blood out of the country. And was it irrelevant to the subject before the House for him (Mr. WATTERSON) to speak of those who wanted to come into power? But, in order or out of order, the House had given him liberty to proceed, and he would do so? Who acted in the Harrisburg Convention as

VICE PRESIDENTS?

THOMAS METCALF, of Kentucky. He was a Representative to Congress in 1825, and voted for John Quincy Adams.

ELISHA M. HUNTINGDON, of Indiana, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

PETER R. LIVINGSTON, of New York, a retired lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JACOB BURNET, of Ohio, lawyer, is an avowed Federalist, and wore the black cockade in 1798. But let him speak for himself:

CINCINNATI, Nov. 1837.

DEAR SIR: Though I am not disposed to say much, or indeed any thing of myself, further than is necessary in stating the transactions in which I participated, yet I am unwilling to conceal the fact, that I was, and ALWAYS HAVE BEEN, A FEDERALIST. Educated in that school, I retain and CHERISH THE NAME, as descriptive of the purest Republican patriots the country has ever produced.

JACOB BURNET.

To J. DELAFIELD, JR.

I would add, that Judge Burnet was one of Gen. Harrison's chief spokesmen in the convention. So well were the delegates pleased with his speech, in which he pronounced Harrison a Jeffersonian Republican, that, by a vote of the convention, it was appended to their proceedings. It has also been published in pamphlet form in this city, and extensively circulated throughout the country. Verily, it appears a little odd to hear "black cockade Federalists" eulogizing men for their "Jeffersonian Republicanism."

Mr. LINCOLN again called Mr. W. to order; and an animated debate arose, in which Mr. LINCOLN, BROWN of Tennessee, CHIFFORD, BELL, WISE, CHAPMAN, and CUSHING participated.

Mr. CRABB moved that the gentleman from Tennessee be permitted to proceed; which motion was agreed to.

Mr. WATTERSON then resumed his remarks. He said he was anxious to get at General Harrison's principles, and the principles of the Whig party generally, which he could not do, without going into the Harrisburg convention, and seeing who were there. Although it might not be very palatable to Whig members, to see the war carried into their own camp, yet he hoped they would stand the fire, and not jump behind the rules of the House quite so often for protection. But even the rules were not wide enough to cover over that convention; for if he were stopped, he pledged himself that their names should appear in his published speech. But he was obliged to the House for leave

to go on, and should continue his biographical sketch.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

JOHN ANDREW SCHULTZ of Pennsylvania. He was elected Governor of that State by the Democratic party, but soon evinced symptoms of apostasy, and ultimately leaped over into the Federal ranks, where he has been a valiant soldier for near ten years.

JAMES WILSON of New Hampshire, lawyer, anti-war Federalist, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams. When a candidate for Governor of that State, in 1838, he advocated the most ultra Abolition doctrines. "Congress has power," said he, in reply to the interrogatories of the Abolitionist, "to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, and the slave trade there and between the States. *I am of opinion Congress ought, without delay, to exercise the power that body has over the subject.*"

ISAAC C. BATES of Massachusetts, lawyer, bank director, agent for Massachusetts claims, member of the State council, an old Federalist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

Here Mr. CUSHING called Mr. WATTERSON to order, and the question of "order" was debated by Messrs. DAWSON, DUNCAN, and others, when

On motion of Mr. BANKS of Virginia,

Mr. WATTERSON was permitted to proceed. He was unfortunate, he observed, in having so many points of "order" raised upon him, particularly as his colleague had spoken nearly seven hours, and, a part of the time, had wandered much further from the subject before the House than he had done. Why did not these great sticklers for "order" arrest *his* remarks? Why did they not bring him back from France, whither he had roved in search of vampires? No, no; their "bull" was then goring "our ox," and it was all well enough; but so soon as the "goring" commences on the other side, the "galled jades" begin to "wince," and they bellow out "foul play." Now for the other

VICE PRESIDENTS.

JOHN S. PETERS of Connecticut, physician, and a stockholder in banks. He was once a Jackson man, but deserted about the time of the panic, which was gotten up by the Opposition, in consequence of the removal of the deposits from the Bank of the United States.

DAVID HAZARD of Delaware, merchant, director of a bank, and was for John Quincy Adams.

GEORGE HOWARD of Maryland, formerly Governor, and was for John Quincy Adams.

EPHRAIM MARSH of New Jersey, proprietor and keeper of a hotel at a fashionable watering place, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN OWEN of North Carolina, planter.

SECRETARIES.

CHARLES B. PENROSE, of Pennsylvania, lawyer. He made a two days' speech in the Legislature of that State, in 1834, against the Bank of the United States, and such was his decided opposition to that institution and the Whig party, that he was re-elected in 1835 or 6. But lo! to the astonishment of every body, he immediately tumbled over into the Federal ranks, and to cap the climax of his apostasy, voted for the recharter of the bank, and by his influence carried the measure over the heads of the

Democracy. He is also notorious on account of the part which he took in the memorable "buck-shot war" at Harrisburg in 1838, and will never be forgotten for the heroic exploit, whilst Speaker of the Senate at that time, of becoming frightened at his own imagination and jumping out of the back window.

SYLVANUS R. LYMAN, of Maine, merchant. He is now a member of the Legislature, and voted for a resolution instructing the Representatives in Congress, from that State, to rescind the resolution refusing to receive or act upon Abolition petitions.

CHARLES PAINE, of Vermont, manufacturer, and the son of Elijah Paine, who was appointed District Judge of Vermont by the elder Adams. He was for John Quincy Adams.

GEORGE W. RALPH, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

I will now, Mr. Speaker, take up the States represented in the Harrisburg convention in geographical order.

MAINE.

JOHN NEAL, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

Samuel Bradley, another delegate to the Harrisburg convention, is a lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

Here Mr. W. was again called to order by

Mr. SALTONSTALL, who said he would like to know what the *Hartford* convention had to do with the subject before the House.

Mr. WISE must in justice say, after making a speech in favor of the gentleman from Tennessee, that his imagination could not see the relevancy of his remarks.

Mr. WATTERSON. I have said nothing about the Hartford Convention. The gentleman from Massachusetts seems to be extremely sensitive on that subject, and furnishes a striking illustration of the fact that the "wicked fleeth, when no man pursueth." I am very sorry to be called to order so often. If members of the Opposition on this floor would strictly confine themselves to order, I would strictly confine myself to order. If gentlemen will not permit me to lay before the House the complexion of the delegates to the Harrisburg Convention, they cannot deprive me of the privilege of doing so when I write out my remarks. But as I have sat here from day to day, and listened to Whig members making party speeches, which had no relevancy; not the most remote, to the subject before the House, I little expected, I confess, to hear myself called to order so repeatedly from that quarter.

[Cries of "go on," "go on," from many—let's have all their names]

Mr. WATTERSON said, no. Leave had been given him to proceed several times, and before he could define the position of more than a single delegate or two in that convention, he was again called to order; and he was now determined to go on with his comments, which he supposed would be in order.

[Names of the delegates from the different States in the Harrisburg Convention, which Mr. W. was not permitted to lay before the House. But he pledged himself that they should appear in his written speech, and here they are:]

MAINE.

ELISHA H. ALLEN, lawyer. He is a member of the Legislature of that State, and recently voted to instruct their Representatives in Congress to rescind W. Cost Johnson's resolution against the reception of Abolition petitions.

GEORGE PENDLETON, merchant, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

RICHARD H. VOSE, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ZINA HYDE, merchant, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

GODFREY STEPHENS, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

SOLOMON MCNEIL, speculator, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JAMES WILSON, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOEL EASTMAN, lawyer, Abolitionist, a defeated candidate for Congress, and was for John Quincy Adams.

MASSACHUSETTS.

PELEG SPRAGUE, a lawyer, was for John Quincy Adams, and formerly a Senator in Congress from Maine. He came to Boston, it is shrewdly suspected, because he was too aristocratic for Democratic Maine.

SAMUEL HOAR, lawyer, Federalist of the bluest sort, bank director, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ARTEMAS LEE, manufacturer, Abolitionist, bank director, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN HOWARD, cashier of the Springfield Bank, and was for John Quincy Adams.

HARRISON GRAY OTIS COLBY, lawyer, bank director, and was for John Quincy Adams.

BENJAMIN K. HOUGH, speculator, and was for John Quincy Adams. His father is president of a bank.

GEORGE ASHMAN, lawyer, bank director—was for John Quincy Adams, and would like to be in Congress.

BARKER BURNELL, cashier of Manufacturers' and Mechanics' Bank, Nantucket, and an aspirant for Mr. Reed's seat in Congress. He was for John Quincy Adams.

HENRY SHAW, lawyer, director in the Agricultural Bank, Pittsfield, has a strong hankering to be in Congress, and was for John Quincy Adams.

NATHANIEL M. DAVIS, lawyer, bank director and was for John Quincy Adams.

CHARLES HUDSON, clergyman, Director of Western Railroad, member of the State Council, bitter Federalist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

WARREN LOVERING, lawyer, bank commissioner, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JAMES H. DUNCAN, lawyer, president of the Merimack Bank at Haverhill, member of the State Council, and was for John Quincy Adams.

RICHARD HAUGHTON, editor of the Boston Atlas, and it is said was not a delegate to the Harrisburg Convention, but went as *tender* to Peleg Sprague. As his name is found, however, among the list of delegates for Massachusetts, it is sufficient to say that he is an Abolition apologist, (as is almost every other delegate from that State) and was for John Quincy Adams.

RHODE ISLAND.

GEORGE G. KING, lawyer, bank commissioner,

bank stockholder, and was for John Quincy Adams. In 1839, he made a speech in the Legislature of Rhode Island against Mr. Atherton's anti-Abolition resolutions, adopted by the House of Representatives in Congress, and in favor of the Abolition cause generally.

JAMES F. SIMMONS, president of a bank in the city of Providence, is a large stockholder in banks, and an old Federalist. He was for John Quincy Adams, and is now a warm admirer of that veteran in Federal doctrines, except when he kicks out of the traces, and then he curses him. Mr. Simmons is a leading politician in Rhode Island, and an aspirant for a seat in the Senate of the United States. A little better than a year ago, he made a speech against ATHERTON'S resolutions, in which he aimed to conciliate the Abolitionists.

WILLIAM ANTHONY, manufacturer, bank director, and was for John Quincy Adams.

BYRON D. MAN, manufacturer, a stockholder in several banks, was a *quasi* Jackson man until Jackson vetoed the Bank. He is now the Whig candidate for lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island.

CONNECTICUT.

CHARLES DAVIES, editor of a Federal newspaper in the city of Hartford.

WM. W. BOARDMAN, lawyer, and bank stockholder.

CHARLES H. PHELPS, lawyer, bank director and stockholder, and was for John Quincy Adams.

CHARLES HAWLY, lawyer, bank attorney and stockholder, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOSEPH S. GLADDING, manufacturer, president of the Jewett county bank, and was for John Quincy Adams.

E. CHAMPION BACON, lawyer, son of the president of a bank, and was for John Quincy Adams.

EBENEZER JACKSON, lawyer, bank attorney, and was for John Quincy Adams.

VERMONT.

WM. HENRY, bank stockholder, cashier of a bank, and was for John Quincy Adams.

A. B. W. TENNEY, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

SAMUEL H. HOLLY, lawyer, Abolitionist, lives in Mr. Slade's district, and is one of his right hand men. He was for John Quincy Adams.

WM. B. BRIGGS, lawyer, and Abolition lecturer. He was for John Quincy Adams, a postmaster under his administration, and was turned out under the administration of General Jackson.

NEW YORK.

CHANDLER STARR, merchant, bank commissioner, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN A. KING, lawyer, son of Rufus King, and was appointed *Chargé d'Affaires* to England by John Quincy Adams. He is the same man who lately introduced a resolution into the Legislature of New York, denouncing a resolution adopted by this House, in regard to Abolition petitions, together with the Democratic Representatives from that State who voted for it.

DUDLEY SELDEN, lawyer, and bank director.

JUDAH HAMMOND, lawyer, and speculator in real estate, in the city of New York.

JAMES A. HAMILTON, a retired lawyer, aristocrat, and the son of Alexander Hamilton.

ROBT. C. WETMORE, merchant, bank director, and was for John Quincy Adams.

HUDSON MCFARLAND, manufacturer, director of a bank, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

HENRY ROSS, lawyer, and would be the last man to drink hard cider, until the Champagne was exhausted.

ELIPHAS FAY, school teacher, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ELISHA JENKINS, a gentleman of pleasure, and was for John Quincy Adams.

AMOS BRIGGS, manufacturer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

SOLOMON VAN RENSELLAER. He belongs to the Albany aristocracy, and was lately removed from the post office in that city. He is an old Federalist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

HENRY HAMILTON, lawyer, canal commissioner, and was for John Quincy Adams.

J. KNICKERBOCKER, lawyer, president of the Waterford Bank, shaver, a blue light Federalist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

BERNARD BLAIR, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

SYLVESTER GILBERT, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

DAVID PETRIE, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

C. P. KIRKLAND, lawyer, a defeated candidate for Congress, and was for John Quincy Adams.

A. Z. MCCARTY, lawyer, a Federalist of the old school, and was for John Quincy Adams.

D. D. SPENCER, editor, bookseller, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN RUSSELL, physician, and was for John Quincy Adams.

VINCENT WHITNEY, a gentleman of pleasure. He turned Democrat, got office, and then returned to his first love.

JAMES DUNN, lawyer, editor, and was for John Quincy Adams.

AMOS P. GRANGER, speculator and shaver.

J. D. LEDYARD, a gentleman of leisure, and was for John Quincy Adams.

GEO. H. WOOD, lawyer, aristocrat, and was for John Quincy Adams.

GARY V. SACKET, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

HENRY W. TAYLOR, lawyer, Abolitionist, aristocrat, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN N. DOX, lawyer.

PHINEAS L. TRACY, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ALLEN AYRAUTH, president of a bank, a shaver, and would take "the pound of flesh" from the tenant of a "log cabin," in the twinkling of an eye, or as soon as any other named man.

CHAUNCY TUCKER, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ROBT. SMITH, owner of an extensive stone cutting establishment in the city of New York.

DAVIS F. ALLEN, director of the City Bank of Buffalo, and assisted in gutting it. The bank is blown sky high, and he with it.

HENRY P. VOORHEES, a retired merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

PENNSYLVANIA.

MOSES J. CLARK, one of Thaddeus Stephens's canal commissioners under the administration of Ritner, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOSEPH LAWRENCE, a defeated candidate for Congress. My friend Leet laid him out as cold as a wagon tire.

JONATHAN ROBERTS, once a Senator in Congress, a bitter, broken down politician, and was for John Quincy Adams.

E. C. REIGART, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN SWIFT, lawyer, and Mayor of Philadelphia.

ALEXANDER QUINTON, tavern keeper, a regular built Federalist, and has always been opposed to Republican men and measures.

COLLIN M. CREED, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JAMES CALHOUN, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

GEORGE CHAMBERS, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN ADAMS FISHER, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

WM. R. MORRIS, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN DICKEY, merchant, and, like his friend Penrose, voted in the Pennsylvania Legislature for the recharter of the Bank of the United States, in violation of pledges made to his constituents, and the principles which he professed when elected.

DAVID LEECH, president of Leech's Transportation Company on the Pennsylvania canal, and was for John Quincy Adams.

EDWARD DARLINGTON, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Q. Adams.

SAMUEL M. BARCLAY, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Q. Adams.

E. T. McDOWELL, lawyer, is for universal free negro suffrage, and was for John Q. Adams.

JAMES MERRILL, lawyer, Abolitionist, and was for John Q. Adams.

CYRUS P. MARKLE, manufacturer, and was for John Q. Adams.

THOMAS E. COCHRAN, editor of a Federal newspaper.

T. H. PATTERSON, speculator.

A. O. CAHOON, merchant, and was for John Q. Adams.

BELA BADGER, one of the judges of the election in the Northern Liberties of Philadelphia, in 1838, where such frauds were perpetrated. To say more of him is unnecessary.

NEW JERSEY.

ASA WHITEHEAD, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

DUDLEY S. GREGORY, lottery broker, and was for John Q. Adams.

THOS. A. HARTWELL, lawyer, and was John Q. Adams.

JOHN D. HAGER, clerk on a steamboat, and was for John Q. Adams.

CRAIG MOFFITT, lawyer, and was for Adams, if old enough.

ROBT. E. HORNER, printer, and was for John Q. Adams.

DELAWARE.

THOMAS RODNEY, a gentleman of leisure, and was for John Q. Adams.

PRESTLY SPRUANCE, merchant, and was for John Q. Adams.

PETER F. CAUSEY, merchant, and was for John Q. Adams.

JOSHUA G. BAKER, school teacher, and was for John Q. Adams.

WM. D. WAPLES, a dismissed mail contractor, and was for John Q. Adams.

MARYLAND.

REVERDY JOHNSON, lawyer, and director of the Bank of Maryland when it blew up, and ruined hundreds.

HENRY PAGE, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

WILLIAM PRICE, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

RICHARD J. BOWIE, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

JOHN LEEDS KERR, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

J. N. GOLDSBOROUGH, planter, and was for John Q. Adams.

ROBT W. BOWIE, planter, and was for John Q. Adams.

JAMES MOORES, planter, and was for John Q. Adams.

ASHTON ALEXANDER, physician.

VIRGINIA.

BENJAMIN WATKINS LEIGH, lawyer, and a leading member of the Harrisburg convention. He made a speech in the Virginia convention, in which he contended that the log cabin men, whom he called the peasantry, ought not to be entitled to the right of suffrage, any more than the slaves, as they were not qualified to judge of political affairs. Now, I presume, he is the very pink of Democracy, and is exceedingly fond of hard cider.

JAMES W. PEGRAM, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ED. R. CHAMBERS, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

WM. C. MOSEBY, lawyer.

FESTUS DICKINSON, lawyer.

WILLOUGHBY NEWTON, lawyer.

HENRY BERRY, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

AUGUSTUS WATERMAN, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

B. G. BALDWIN, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JESSE EDGINGTON, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

Wm. S. Archer, lawyer, once a Jackson man, but has been violently opposed to the Democratic party ever since Mr. Stevenson received the appointment of Minister to England.

JOHN JANNEY, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JONES GREEN, lawyer, and was for J. Q. Adams
Gen. J. B. HARVEY, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

ISAAC A. COLES, planter, and was for John Quincy Adams.

NORTH CAROLINA.

JAMES MEBANE, planter, and was for John Quincy Adams.

FREDERICK J. HILL, physician, and was for John Quincy Adams.

CHARLES R. KINNEY, lawyer.

JOHN B. KELLY, lawyer.

W. H. BATTLE, lawyer.

BURGESS S. GAITHER, lawyer.
 JOHN C. WASHINGTON, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.
 ISAAC BURNS, Physician, and was for John Quincy Adams.
 WM. F. DAVIDSON, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.
 NATHANIEL M. ROAN, physician.
 HENRY W. MILLER, lawyer.
 JOSEPH R. LOYD, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.
 WM. W. CHERRY, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

KENTUCKY.

LESLIE COMBS, lawyer, land speculator, "Chickasaw Ambassador," and was for John Quincy Adams.

JAMES SHELBY, one of the most extensive and wealthy stock raisers in the State of Kentucky, and was for John Quincy Adams.

CASSIUS M. CLAY, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

WILLIAM PRESTON, an aristocratic lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

DAVID BANKS, bank officer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

MARSHALL KEY, clerk of a court, and was for John Quincy Adams.

OHIO.

N. G. PENDETON, lawyer, a twice defeated candidate for Congress, and was for John Quincy Adams.

BENJAMIN BENTLEY, president of a bank.

JOHN JOHNSON, defaulter, a Hamiltonian Federalist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

CYRUS FALCONER, physician.

WM. S. MURPHY, lawyer, and the same man whose card, denouncing Senator Allen, was paraded in the columns of the *Madisonian* not long since. The reason of his bullying proclamation will be duly appreciated when the fact is made known, that he, the aforesaid Wm. S. Murphy, was a candidate for Congress, in 1833, against Mr. Allen, and only received *one vote* in the town in which he resided, and but *fifty-five votes* in the whole district, out of six or eight thousand! And such was the insignificance of the man, to use no harsher term, that Mr. Allen scorned to notice the outpourings of his malice.

JOHN M. CREED, lawyer and a defeated candidate for Congress.

IRA BELKNAPP, speculator, and was for John Quincy Adams.

BENJAMIN S. COWAN, lawyer, Abolitionist and bank attorney.

CHARLES T. SHERMAN, lawyer.

CYRUS PRENTISS, merchant, canal contractor.

TRACY BRONSON, physician, Abolitionist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

HOLLAND GREEN, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JOHN S. LACY, tavern keeper.

INDIANA.

DOULASS MCGUIRE, printer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

AMOS CLARK, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

JAMES PERRY, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

MILTON STAPP, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

R. W. THOMPSON, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

THOS. J. EVANS, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

SAMUEL HANNA, merchant, and was for John Quincy Adams.

LOUISIANA.

J. MASON GRAHAM, planter on Red river.

MISSISSIPPI.

T. C. TUPPER, lawyer.

ANDERSON MILLER, land speculator, and gentleman of pleasure.

ILLINOIS.

GEORGE W. RALPH, lawyer.

W. S. NEWBERRY, merchant.

WM. B. WARREN, merchant.

ALABAMA.

HENRY HILLIARD, lawyer, preacher, and editor.

W. H. SMITH editor.

JOHN M. SWOPE, merchant.

MISSOURI.

W. H. RUSSELL, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

LOGAN HUNTON, lawyer, and was for John Q. Adams.

URIEL WRIGHT, lawyer.

MICHIGAN.

GEO. C. BATES, lawyer, an old Federalist, and was for John Quincy Adams.

THOMAS J. DRAKE, lawyer, and was for John Quincy Adams.

A. S. McREYNOLDS, merchant.

ARKANSAS.

B. H. MARTIN, lawyer and a gentleman of pleasure.

[The foregoing list embraces every delegate in the Harrisburg Convention, but eight or nine, whose professions, &c. I could not learn, as they are represented in Congress by Whigs. It will be seen that they are nearly all lawyers, merchants, bank officers, and Abolitionists. Not a log cabin man in the whole catalogue.]

Mr. W. again resumed his remarks. He said the information he had been prevented from laying before the House, would show whose candidate General Harrison was. It would show what kind of "conscript fathers," as he had seen them termed by the Whig press, had assembled at Harrisburg, and nominated him. It would show that, in that convention, there was every hue of opinion—slaveholders and Abolitionists, high tariffites, and those who are for "free trade," Hartford Convention Federalists, and apostate Republicans, latitudinarians, and those who profess to be strict constructionists. No wonder they did not publish an address to the people of the United States setting forth their principles. No wonder Mr. Leigh of Virginia violently opposed, and the convention almost unanimously voted down such a proposition. They knew very well that if all their conflicting principles were spread out before the American people, they could no longer humbug and delude thousands who are honestly co-operating with them. They thought it their best policy to continue their old crusade against the Republican party—without showing their own hands—by misrepresenting facts—impugning motives—crying out corruption—prodigal expenditures—defalcations—bankrupt Treasury—

distress—ruin—bloodhounds—bull-dogs—and rascality generally. Sir, with these weapons they have been fighting for years; but thanks to the patriotism and intelligence of the country, such slang and slander make no more impression on the minds of the honest-hearted and sturdy Democrats, than the falling of a sun-parched leaf upon the Rocky mountains. If it had, sir, you would have heard much oftener the roar of cannon, and the voice of Federal orators, celebrating Whig victories.

It would show, a'so, Mr. Speaker, that aside from their ring-streaked and striped politics, nine-tenths of the delegates in the Harrisburg Convention were lawyers, doctors, traders, speculators, bank officers, and merchants, who hailed from the cities, towns, and villages. This fact fully explains why it is that the Whig newspapers have been teeming with the proceedings of Harrison meetings, responding to his nomination, to use their own language, in such gallant and enthusiastic style! All the delegates had to do, was to return to their respective towns and villages, call together a few counter-hoppers, brokers, pettifoggers, quacks, and skin-flints, appoint a chairman and secretary, draw up a long preamble and resolutions denunciatory of the whole Democratic party, make a few speeches in favor of "Old Tip," fire a few guns, raise a few shouts and huzzas, drink a few bottles of Champagne and call it hard cider, sing a few Tippecanoe songs, and then what a soul-stirring time they had of it—what a glorious Whig revival—what wonderful reactions! The very next number of the village, town, or city Whig paper, as the case may be, contains a glowing account of the most numerous gathering of the people that had been known for years—a spontaneous movement of the bone and sinew of the land—when, in fact, the real people, the inmates of the "log cabins," had no part nor lot in the grand farce, and not a solitary political feeling in common with the prime movers and participators in it. Hence the reason why the Whigs are so often deceived in regard to the elections. They mistake the voice of the few, for the voice of the many. They do not recollect that one Whig blusterer about a town can, and does, make more noise than one hundred Democrats in the country.

Passing, Mr. Speaker, from this National Whig Convention to their State Conventions, and we find them composed of the same materials, both as it regards their professions and politics. I have seen it stated, that there were appointed to the late Whig Convention of Ohio, five hundred and forty-two bank officers, directors, &c., seven hundred and thirty-three office holders, three hundred and forty-six lawyers and doctors, one thousand and forty-eight merchants, clerks and speculators, and upwards of five hundred Abolitionists.

Mr. MASON asked the gentleman what paper he was reading from?

Mr. WATTERSON answered that it was the Ohio Statesman.

Mr. MASON said the statement was wholly untrue in many particulars, to his knowledge. The designation of the individuals in his county was altogether incorrect; and he had been assured by some of his colleagues that it was equally untrue with regard to the counties in which they resided. Indeed, the whole statement had been publicly contradicted in a paper in his State, [naming it,] and the editor who made it called on to produce the proof, which he failed to do.

Mr. BOND corroborated the statement of his colleague, [Mr. MASON,] and said that the statement, so far as it regarded the individuals living in his county, was wholly destitute of truth.

Mr. WATTERSON said he did not pretend to be personally acquainted with the individuals named in the paper before him. The paper occupied a respectable standing in the State of Ohio, and he had no reason to doubt its statements. He would like, however, to hear from his Democratic friend from Ohio on the subject.

Mr. MEDILL said he was acquainted with but few of the persons named as having been appointed to attend the convention, and had no other information on the subject than he derived through the various papers of the day. He was entirely willing to rest the correctness of the statement with the people of Ohio, on the assertion of the paper in which it is contained, and the denial of his colleague. The names of the delegates that attended the convention from the county in which he, Mr. M. resided, are not given, except to a very limited extent. The official character of the very few that are reported, is correctly designated. Six of them hold appointments under the Federal Government. They are highly respectable; but, so far from residing in "log cabins," and depending for a precarious subsistence on "hard cider," he believed the whole six were merchants, of considerable capital, and who indulged pretty largely in the good things for which that county was so distinguished.

Mr. WELLER observed, that with the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. WATTERSON,] he would like to say a word to his honorable colleague over the way, [Mr. BOND.] The statement made by the Ohio Statesman in relation to the materials which composed the late Whig Convention, had been impeached by his colleague. All he desired to say on this subject was, that so far as that list gave the business and occupations of the delegates appointed from the district which he had the honor to represent, he believed it was strictly correct. He was personally acquainted with nearly all of the individuals named, and therefore had no hesitancy in making the statement.

Mr. WATTERSON. There is one fact which will not be disputed by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BOND.] His political friends in the convention alluded to, would not condescend to let it be known, through the medium of an address, what the Whig party are contending for—what are their principles. No, no. They deemed it more prudent to meet in all the pomp and parade of modern Whigery—in all the antic circumstances of buffoonery—with drums, fifes, bugles, and rams horns—with chicken coops and bald eagles—with bands of bacchanalian singers—with "log cabin" flags floating in the air—with boat loads of Federal orators—with canoes upon wheels, so full of Whig abuse, misrepresentation, calumny, and lawyers eating ginger bread, that it took six horses to pull a single canoe—all for the purpose of hiding the odiousness of their principles from the gaze of an intelligent and Republican people, and diverting their minds from the true issue now before the country. How far they can succeed by such disgusting devices, the ensuing Presidential election will determine.

In connection with this convention I have heard an anecdote, and must ask the indulgence of the House whilst I relate it. It shows conclusively that there was at least one delegate in that numerous and boisterous assemblage, who was immovably honest in his politics, if he were not so in his morals. After the convention had adjourned, and its members had got through their carousals and frolics and debaucheries, one of their number found himself *minus* something under one hundred dollars. Suspicion fastened itself upon a brother delegate. He was taken up—examined—and sure enough the money was found in his possession. Well, sir, this was too bad—something must be

done—it must not go abroad that a Whig had been *Swartwouting*, and they tried to prevail upon him to avow himself a Democrat. “No, gentlemen, said he, no”—you may call me a thief, a rogue, a villain—but by Heaven, he exclaimed (raising his head erect for the first time) you can’t cram Democracy upon me—huzza for “Old Tip.”

Mr. Speaker, my colleague closed his speech with some general remarks, and I will take the same liberty.

In glancing over a Whig paper a short time since, my attention was arrested by an article headed in large capitals, “A VOICE FROM THE SOUTH.” From the flaming caption, I was induced to read it; and what should I learn but the astounding fact that a steamboat had arrived at the port of Mobile; and among the passengers, a vote had been taken for President, the result of which was, twenty-nine for Harrison, and nine for Van Buren! I began to think that the Democratic party were surely upset at last—that such facts could not be resisted; and I do not know but I should have entirely desponded, on my part, and given up the contest, had it not been for a second thought which occurred to me. I recollected that in travelling up the Mississippi river about two years ago, when it was believed Mr. Clay would be the Whig candidate for the Presidency, a gentleman from Philadelphia, with whom I had formed a partial acquaintance, proposed that we should hold an election, and ascertain the preferences of those on board the boat, as between Mr. Clay and Mr. Van Buren. I assented to the proposition, and we made the count. But lo! I was completely trumped, on finding that out of near one hundred cabin passengers, there were but twenty-three or four for Mr. Van Buren! As a matter of course, I became satisfied that Democracy had but few charms for *that* crowd, and was just studying how I should parry the laugh, if I may be permitted to use the expression, which had been raised at my expense, when the captain of the boat, who proved to be a sterling Democrat, dyed in the wool, suggested that there were about one hundred and thirty “deck passengers” that we had not taken into the count, the great majority of whom were substantial farmers, the honest “log cabin” men; from Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, who had been down to New Orleans with their pork and beef, and corn and flour. Go, said he, and see whether they are Whigs or Democrats? We did go, sir, and what do you suppose was the result of our investigation? As well as I can recollect, there were one hundred and three for Mr. Van Buren, and fourteen for Mr. Clay. It is needless for me to add, that the laugh was most essentially turned upon my Philadelphia friend, who declared he had just found out where the Democrats came from at the time of elections, (the log cabins,) and that he never again would be deceived by those who travel in the cabin on steamboats, in stages, on railroads, or who reside in the cities, towns and villages. Sir, he was right. Democracy flourishes best in the country; where, I hesitate not to say, there is more honesty, more virtue, more manly independence, and more substantial intelligence, than can be found in any of your towns, not excepting the city of Wash-

ington, if we are to judge its population by those who composed the Whig “*pow-wows*” not long since, and who disturbed our slumbers by their groans and hisses, and huzzas and bacchanalian shouts. In that living, moving, ranting band, the boys, negroes, loafers, and a new species of the same animal, familiarly known in the city of New York as soap-locks, took the lead, and the rear was brought up by dismissed office holders, disappointed office seekers, mustached Terriers, perfumed *exquisites*, with here and there a gentleman from both political parties, who had been drawn out by curiosity to witness their uproarious proceedings. Sir, I would advise them to reserve their groans for a more appropriate occasion. If they will only wait until next autumn, they will have cause to groan much deeper and much more bitterly—provided such an effect can be produced by the triumph of Democracy. When the vote comes to be taken among the log cabins of the hardy West, of the East, of the North, and of the South, these midnight Whig brawlers will learn that the District of Columbia is but a small spot in the Union, and that if even they were entitled to vote in the election of a President, they could scarcely ripple the current on which the Republican party are now sailing to victory. The principles of the General under whose banner they have enlisted, are not congenial to the spirit of our free institutions. They may hold him up as the “log cabin and hard cider” candidate—they may resort to all the tricks usually practised by demagogues—still it all will not do. The people know their rights, and will maintain them; no matter whether they live in log cabins or more comfortable dwellings; no matter whether they drink hard cider, *pale sherry*, or pure water. Sir, when I first heard Gen. Harrison called the log cabin and hard cider candidate, I could not help smiling at the credulity of his friends in supposing that American freemen could be swerved from their principles by such miserable humbugery. I was forcibly reminded of a gentleman within my knowledge, who became a candidate for the Legislature of his State. He had been very stiff in his manners, rather aristocratic in his feelings, wore his bosom full of ruffles, and withal had taken but little pains to become acquainted with the sovereigns of his country. But so soon as he threw himself before them for their suffrages, all of a sudden, he dashed away his ruffles, his limbs became much more pliant, a pleasant smile played upon his lips, and he seemed to know every body. On seeing a countryman come into town, he would start after him in a long trot, give him a *cordial* shake of the hand, and inquire about the health of his family. It was not long, however, before he caught a Tartar, or, as they say sometimes in my country, waked up the wrong passenger. He met in his new complaisant way, an old Revolutionary Whig, a *true* Whig, sir, who thoroughly understood the science of human nature, and the secret springs which operated upon such men. Sir, said he, to him, “I have known you for ten years; I have never seen you so graciously condescending before; you must be a candidate—now just excuse me if you please, I can’t do any thing for you.” And such, Mr. Speaker, will be the language of the freemen

who occupy leg cabins, when they are "graciously" asked to support the candidate of the moneyed aristocracy of banks and soulless corporations, who would grind them into dust, or put the yoke of despotism upon their necks, if it were their interest to do so. They are not to be caught, like the unsuspecting horse, by holding out to them salt in one hand, and a concealed bridle in the other.

Mr. Speaker, I have often been amused at the facility with which the Whigs can make great men. In twenty-four hours they can manufacture out of straw a perfect Goliath in intellect. All their candidates for political offices are total demolishers. They run over their opponents rough shod on all occasions until the elections come on, and then if they should chance to be demolished, which is no unusual occurrence, great astonishment is excited, and the reason of their defeat is always attributed to any other cause than the correct one. In my own State—I hope I shall be pardoned for speaking of my own State, and even of my own canvass, if I wish, as the example has been set me by my colleague, who is an old member upon this floor, and ought to know what is proper, and what is not proper to be spoken here—in my own State, sir, the Whigs have a remarkable talent for this kind of game. Last summer their candidate for Governor, who is a plain sensible man, and when I say that I have done him ample justice, handled his competitor, who is known throughout the Union as a statesman of commanding talents, and unequalled before a popular assembly, with the same ease that a giant would a lilliputian, and they boastingly proclaimed to their friends every where, that they would carry the State by a majority of twenty thousand votes. Letters were published from every Congressional district, giving the gratifying news that the Whig candidates for Congress and the Legislature were slaying their opponents as Sampson slew the Philistines. They vauntingly avowed that they were not content to whip us merely; they intended to give us such a complete drubbing, that we would remember it all the days of our lives; they were determined to make a clean sweep. To such an extent did they carry this puffing and blowing and bragging system, that I sometimes became really alarmed, not only about the fate of my friends, but that of my own. My opponent was eulogized as the "brave, gallant, chivalrous, talented, eloquent, and whole souled champion" of Whig principles. According to their account of it, he was daily turning scores from the Democratic ranks. It was impossible to resist the arguments that emanated from his gigantic mind. He was walking over the course almost without opposition. I was admonished to retire, and not be disgraced by the signal defeat which awaited me, in the event I continued in the field. (I presume, as I was a young man, they did not wish to nip my political prospects in the bud.) But, foolish like, I heeded not their friendly counsel, and was only elected by the slender majority of about fourteen hundred votes! Well, sir, having, by the aid of my Democratic friends, slain this patent right Hercules of the Whig party, I felt a good deal of interest in the success of my Democratic colleagues upon this floor, [MESSRS. JOHNSON, TURNER, BROWN, McCLELLAN, and BLACKWELL,]

whom I had learned, from the Whig newspapers and letter writers, would be politically butchered and hewn to pieces. Judge my agreeable surprise, when the news reached me that not one of them was elected by a smaller majority than thirteen hundred and fifty, or a larger majority than twenty-three hundred! About this time nothing but dismay and consternation pervaded the Whig ranks. They could not tell what in the name of common sense had got into the heads of the people. They were at a loss to account for their unexpected, but Waterloo defeat. At last a bright idea struck some wag right upon the head, and it was, that the Alabamians had come across the line, and voted for the Democratic candidates. Forthwith the Whig press raised the yelp, and the whole party joined in the chorus. "Alabama, O! the cursed Alabamians," was their cry for months. Not once did they dream that it was a triumph of Democratic principles—the calm judgment of a Republican people, brought to bear upon FEDERALISM, APOSTACY, AND GAG LAW SENATORS.

I see, Mr. Speaker, as I have already intimated, that the same system of boasting and puffing is now being carried on by the Whig party upon an extensive scale. From the disputed territory in Maine, to the Sabine, all is enthusiasm for the hero of Tippecanoe. Thousand and tens of thousands are hourly deserting the Administration and flocking around his standard. They have made the wonderful discovery, too—a discovery for which they richly deserve a patent right—that Harrison is the greatest General that ever "lived in the tide of time," and the greatest statesman of this or any other age. Such is the fiery zeal of the people for him, that the mountains and valleys of the North and East, the prairies of the West, and the woods and green moss of the South, are in a tremendous blaze! To stop the current of public opinion which is setting in his favor, is just as impossible as to stop the current of the mighty Mississippi. The farmer is quitting his plough—the mechanic his square and compass—the lawyer his nisi prius—the physician his pills—and the merchant his counter—all for the purpose of attending public meetings and glorifying the nominee of the Harrisburg Convention. Bonaparte, in all his glory, had not more followers, and never was so sure of victory. In their own chaste lingo, the "spoilers will be routed—the Goths and Vandals driven from the Capitol." Sir, this is what we have been hearing for the last three months—it is what we will continue to hear until the next Presidential election. It is the same cry which the Federal party have put up on the eve of every Presidential contest for the last forty years. But, thank Heaven, it is one thing to crow and another thing to vote. The Democratic party, conscious of the correctness of their principles, are not reduced to the necessity of bringing to their aid such contemptible means. When the time arrives, however, they will march up to the polls, in solid column, and give the allied powers of Whigery such a rout as has never been witnessed in this country. Mark the prediction, Mr. Speaker, and when you and I meet again after the close of this session of Congress, if it is not verified, then you may set me down a false prophet.